

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims are rejected.

Claims 1, 2 and 14 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 7,212,828 (Hind). Claims 1 and 14 are currently amended to recite that distance determination includes sending a reduced power signal to the client and determining whether the client responds. As characterized by the Examiner, Hind uses multiple devices to calculate the client location based on, e.g., triangulation. Claims 1 and 14 thus distinguish Hind. Claims 17 and 18 distinguish Hind for similar reasons. In particular, Hind defines a boundary in terms of spatial position, i.e., 3D coordinates, and then determines the spatial position of a device relative to the boundary. While Hind's technique may be preferable for certain applications, it is considerably more complex than the recited technique. Note that the technique recited in claims 1 and 14 is not dependent on a spatial coordinates but rather a one-dimensional distance relative to another device. Consequently, the boundary moves if the authenticating AP or STA is moved because the requirement is simply that the device to be authenticated is within, e.g., X meters of an AP or authenticated STA in any direction. The Examiner argues that Hind produces an equivalent boundary. Whether or not that assertion is true, the manner in which the boundary is defined is quite different. It is easy for a network administrator to, for example, configure APs to only authenticate clients that are within a 10 meter range and then place APs accordingly in an office space. In contrast, Hind requires knowledge of spatial positions, e.g., GPS coordinates of building walls and WLAN devices.

The dependent claims further distinguish the invention, and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 9, 2009  
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/

Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP  
33 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 160-068  
Dd: 04/09/2009